

## AGENDA # 3

City of Madison, Wisconsin

---

REPORT OF: URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION      **PRESENTED:** June 22, 2011

**TITLE:**      3502 Monroe Street – PUD(GDP-SIP)      **REFERRED:**  
for a Mixed-Use Development with 18      **REREFERRED:**  
Apartments and 3,400 Square Feet of      **REPORTED BACK:**  
Commercial Space. 10<sup>th</sup> Ald. Dist.  
(22566)

**AUTHOR:** Alan J. Martin, Secretary

**ADOPTED:**

**POF:**

**DATED:** June 22, 2011

**ID NUMBER:**

---

Members present were: Marsha Rummel, Richard Wagner, John Harrington, Richard Slayton, Mark Smith, Melissa Huggins, Jay Handy, Todd Barnett, Dawn O’Kroley and Henry Lufler.

### **SUMMARY:**

At its meeting of June 22, 2011, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL** of a PUD(GDP-SIP) located at 3502 Monroe Street. Appearing on behalf of the project were Randy Bruce, representing Rouse Management; Jeff Annen and Mark Landgraf. Bruce presented revised plans which include vehicular access from Wyota and surface parking that extends under the building. The commercial space on the first floor will be approximately 3,500 square feet. The roof plan includes a terrace. The fenestration was of concern to the Commission at their informational presentation; Bruce now is using different materials and fenestrations to create individual storefronts rather than one building. The Monroe Street elevation will be a two-story masonry coursing with hardipanel up above. French balconies at the second level adds scale. The same treatment wraps around onto Glenway Street with frontage available for commercial and the entrance for residential above. The rear elevation shows how the brick base will step down and create a one-story element across the bottom of the building. Internal discussions have led them to look at the possibility of wrapping the corner element around the first three stories rather than just the first story with brick masonry, thus giving the corner more prominence. Barnett liked the idea of extending the masonry coursing upwards to make the building a better anchor. He suggested looking at the side elevations where the change occurs; he finds it a little arbitrary. He inquired about the window limitations on the southwest elevation. Bruce replied that they do have some limitations, Barnett suggested looking at a treatment that ties the whole building together. He also asked for drawings that show the next building and the street edge to help clarify the issue of obscurity. Harrington is not sold on the upper part because of the vertical and horizontal hard elements and all the different movement of masses. He also expressed concern with the tower because it seems to have a different massing. He inquired about their stormwater plans; Bruce responded that the entire site is already paved, and that because of the size of the site City Engineering is not imposing any conditions. They do have plans for a green roof and are trying to create some areas for infiltration. The stormwater that will land on the exterior paved surface will be cleaned. While they may not be reducing stormwater very much the water that does leave the site will now be clean. Slayton suggested raising the trellis up at the corner. Rummel thought the plans seemed much more simple and less cluttered now. What concerns her is the corner, she is unsure about what it wants to be. Bruce replied they have received concerns from Planning staff on this same issue so they will be doing further planning to solve

the problem. Huggins wondered about the configurations of the apartments and whether there are windows in all the spaces, Bruce replied yes. Smith asked how large the balconies would be on the second floor, as French balconies they are not much more than railings. Non-street façade balconies will be 5-feet in depth. Smith finds this very successful. More troubling to Smith than the patterning on the third floor are the proportion of the opaque material above all the window openings, which seems much taller than on the second floor. That leads to the confusion about the break between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> floors. The top of the third floor with a different material might solve the problem. He does like the conceptual idea of tying the Iota elevations in the back of the building and trying to pull some of that around the building so it doesn't look like an old western storefront and a completely different construction in the back. Bruce thought they could look at reducing some of the parapet height in other locations, other architectural treatments at that level that might help cut the eye, and maybe raising the brick up solves the problem entirely. Smith thinks it is important that there are operable windows or pocket doors on the Monroe Street façade.

Jeff Annen spoke as a long-time neighborhood resident. He is in favor of what they see in the conceptual plans, and like the idea of possibly bringing a restaurant to their area of the neighborhood. He is sorry to see Parman's go but understands it's time to update the site.

### **ACTION:**

On a motion by Barnett, seconded by Rummel, the Urban Design Commission **GRANTED INITIAL APPROVAL**. The motion was passed on a vote of (8-0). The motion provided for the following:

- Look at extending the brick on the main façade.
- Alternative treatments of the wood fiber cement elements.
- Different fenestration treatments for a potential restaurant location to make it more transparent to the street.
- Look at scaling down the parapet.

After the Commission acts on an application, individual Commissioners rate the overall design on a scale of 1 to 10, including any changes required by the Commission. The ratings are for information only. They are not used to decide whether the project should be approved. The scale is 1 = complete failure; 2 = critically bad; 3 = very poor; 4 = poor; 5 = fair; 6 = good; 7 = very good; 8 = excellent; 9 = superior; and 10 = outstanding. The overall ratings for this project are 6, 6, 6, 6, 7, 8 and 8.

**URBAN DESIGN COMMISSION PROJECT RATING FOR: 3502 Monroe Street**

	Site Plan	Architecture	Landscape Plan	Site Amenities, Lighting, Etc.	Signs	Circulation (Pedestrian, Vehicular)	Urban Context	Overall Rating
<b>Member Ratings</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
	-	7	6	6	-	8	8	7
	5	6	-	-	-	5	7	6
	6	5	6	-	-	-	7	6
	6	6	6	-	-	-	7	6
	7	7	6	6	-	7	8	8

General Comments:

- Infill that fits size of lot – still needs some thought, but like direction.
- Much improved.
- “Dutch door” type windows on first floor?
- Much better!